

**Appendix B**

**Additional Hydrologic Modeling Information**

---

## **Appendix B**

### **Part B1: Responses to 2000 REIR/REIS Modeling Comments**

#### **PROSIM 99 Analyses Conducted Since the 1997 DEIR/DEIS**

Since the publication of the Draft EIR/EIS for the Supplemental Water Supply Project in November 1997, supplemental PROSIM analyses were conducted with the most recent version of PROSIM, referred to as PROSIM 99, released by Reclamation in November 1998. A detailed presentation of the modifications incorporated into PROSIM 99 was made by Reclamation at a public workshop on November 20, 1998. In comparison to PROSIM Version 5.73, which was used for the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, PROSIM 99 includes a number of enhancements: 1) a correction for the inconsistency in the input hydrology associated with the use of theoretical storage, 2) a revised nodal configuration, 3) improved logic for the coordination of Trinity and Shasta Division operations, 4) updated logic for implementation of 3406(b)(2) water management actions, and 5) miscellaneous corrections to the input hydrology.

Some minor modifications, which do not affect any of the basic PROSIM operations logic, were made to the PROSIM 99 model code to allow simulation of the Supplemental Water Supply Project alternatives. The code was modified to allow a monthly time series of EBMUD demands generated by EBMUDSIM to be used in conjunction with the PROSIM 99 Hodge Decision logic to determine when EBMUD will make diversions into the Folsom South Canal. The code was also modified to allow PROSIM 99 to simulate multiple return flows from a diversion at the joint facility in Alternative 3. This change allowed the use of a time series of return flow values to be specified at the joint facility to match the timing of the preprocessed monthly diversions to the City, County, and EBMUD.

PROSIM 99 simulations were conducted for each of the three 1997 Draft EIR/EIS alternatives. The PROSIM 99 data set released by Reclamation in November 1998 was used as the basis for the Alternative 1 (No Action) simulation. This data set incorporated the latest information and assumptions regarding future 2030 CVP operations that were available at the time. The data set was revised to incorporate projected future 2030 American River water demands as defined in Table 3-2 of the 2000 REIR/REIS.

The Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP) instream flows were maintained in all river reaches for the future No Action and all action alternatives. The "bypass flow" below any EBMUD diversion is modeled to meet or exceed the AFRP requirement.

The revised PROSIM 99 simulations for Alternatives 2 and 3 incorporated the terms included in the draft amendatory water service contract negotiated between Reclamation and EBMUD. In July 2000, a technical team composed of modeling experts from Reclamation, Surface Water Resources, Inc. (SWRI), EBMUD, and CH2MHILL reviewed the PROSIM 99 simulations and concluded that the studies were reasonable and incorporated the best available information available at the time the analyses were conducted.

Upstream reoperation modeling performed by the Water Forum was not made available to EBMUD despite repeated requests, including a Freedom of Information Act request. Reclamation commissioned an effort to document the Water Forum work, which was completed in March 2000. Reclamation is currently reviewing this documentation.

Analysis of the results of the PROSIM 99 simulations showed that the incremental differences between Alternatives 2 and 3 and the No-Action condition were very similar to the results presented in the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS. Detailed results of the PROSIM 99 simulations are available on request from EBMUD.

## **EBMUD Diversion Assumptions Per Draft Amendatory Contract**

The revised PROSIM 99 simulations for Alternative 2 and 3 incorporated the terms included in the draft amendatory water service contract negotiated between Reclamation and EBMUD. The demand for supplemental water by EBMUD used in the PROSIM 99 simulations was computed using the EBMUDSIM model.

EBMUD diversions under Alternative 2 would occur when there is available storage in EBMUD's system and when flows below Nimbus are above the flows stipulated in the Hodge Decision. The modeling did not assume that water would be diverted whenever flows were above the Hodge Decision requirements. The Hodge logic developed by Reclamation assumes that the AFRP flows and the 3406(b)(2) water management measures act as a surrogate for the 60,000 acre-feet carry-over requirement. Per the draft amendatory water service contract, it was assumed that EBMUD diversions are subject to CVP north of Delta municipal and industrial water service allocation, and EBMUD is only allowed to divert up to maximum of 133 thousand acre-feet (taf) per year if there are deficiencies to CVP north of Delta water service contractors. EBMUD was not allowed to divert water if the diversion would cause reductions in deliveries to north of Delta CVP water service contractors.

EBMUD diversions under Alternative 3 would occur only in dry years when the March projection of end-of-September EBMUD total system storage drops below 500 taf, and rationing to EBMUD customers is triggered. EBMUD diversions were limited to 165 taf over any three consecutive years per the draft amendatory contract.

## **Appropriateness of Post-Processing Alternatives 4 through 8**

A technical team composed of modeling experts from Reclamation, SWRI, EBMUD, and CH2MHILL reviewed the operating criteria for Alternative 4 and recommended that the results of the PROSIM 99 simulation for Alternative 2 be post-processed to evaluate the impacts of Alternative 4. This is a reasonable approach because operations under Alternative 4 would only vary slightly from Alternative 2 from a modeling standpoint. Alternative 4 American River operations would be very similar since the logic for the Hodge Decision is consistent with that used in the PROSIM99 simulation of Alternative 2. Alternative 4 incorporates more restrictive diversion criteria than Alternative 2, so the anticipated results of the analysis would fall within the range of impacts already characterized by Alternative 2 and No-Action Alternative 1.

The diversions under Alternative 2 would occur when EBMUD has supplemental water demand and American River flows below Nimbus are above Hodge Decision flow criteria. In addition, the diversions are limited to a maximum intake capacity of 350 cubic feet per second (cfs). The Alternative 2 diversions were post-processed to evaluate two Alternative 4 delivery scenarios assuming EBMUD diverted the water on the same pattern developed in Alternative 2. Scenario 1 assumes that EBMUD diversions would be subject to Hodge Decision flow criteria and a maximum intake capacity of 155 cfs. Scenario 2 additionally limits EBMUD diversions if the forecast unimpaired inflow to Folsom Reservoir is less than 1.6 million acre-feet (maf) for the period March through September. In the post-processing exercise, the volume of the Alternative 2 diversions was reduced to account for the more restrictive conditions in Scenarios 1 and 2. In months where the EBMUD diversion was reduced, the water that could not be diverted under Alternative 4 was added back into the river flow or assumed to remain in Folsom Reservoir storage, depending on CVP operating conditions that governed at the time.

The technical team reviewed Alternatives 5 through 8 and proposed that a PROSIM 99 simulation conducted by EBMUD that included an EBMUD dry year diversion at the Site 5 location on the lower American river would provide a good basis for evaluation of the Sacramento River and Delta intake facilities. The flows in the Sacramento River entering the Delta under Alternatives 5, 6, and 7 would be very similar to the flows shown in the PROSIM 99 simulation results. Under Alternative 8, the Sacramento River inflows to the Delta would be higher, since the EBMUD diversion would be located in the Delta rather than upstream. Delta outflow would be the same as in the PROSIM 99 simulation for Alternatives 5 through 8. Based on the simplified representation of the Sacramento River and Delta in the PROSIM 99 model, as well as the small incremental differences between the PROSIM 99 simulation and the No-Action Alternative (Alternative 1), this approach provides the required information for analysis of Alternatives 5 through 8.

A summary of the average differences in hydrologic characteristics between the results of Alternatives 4 through 8 and the No-Action Alternative are shown in Table 3-3 of the 2000 REIR/REIS.

## **Need to Provide Cumulative Hydrologic Analysis for New Alternatives**

The 1997 Draft EIR/EIS presented an Alternative 2 cumulative condition that assumed that the Nimbus diversion would be operated continuously at its maximum capacity of 350 cfs. This operation simulates the maximum potential impact if the diversion were operated to meet EBMUD planned outage needs under a worst-case cumulative condition. An Alternative 3 cumulative condition that assumed that the intake structure on the lower American River would be operated continuously at its maximum capacity of 217 cfs was also presented. This operation is assumed to simulate the maximum potential impact of Alternative 3 under a worst-case cumulative condition. This condition also simulates full use of Sacramento County's 40-million-gallon per day (MGD) dedicated conveyance capacity, should the County secure entitlements in addition to its PL 101-514 (Fazio) water. By agreement with the County, potential additional use of a portion of EBMUD's dedicated capacity would be subject to additional environmental documentation. Since the PROSIM 99 modeling results are not substantively different from the results presented in the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS analysis covers the range of potential impacts that might be possible under a Sacramento River or Delta diversion cumulative scenario.

## **Part B2**

This section contains the following information:

- A discussion of recent modeling and analysis carried out by EBMUD.
- A discussion of PROSIM modifications carried out by Reclamation.
- A series of tables comparing fishery analyses using PROSIM modeling from the Draft EIR/EIS and PROSIM 99 modeling.
- A series of tables displaying PROSIM 99 output tables for key storage and flow locations.

### **I. Modeling and Analyses of SWSP Alternatives**

#### **Model Modifications**

The SWSP alternatives were simulated again after release of PROSIM 99.0 by Reclamation. This section describes the simulation and resultant analyses for the SWSP alternatives. The changes reflected in PROSIM 99.0 are discussed further below. Some minor modifications to the PROSIM 99.0 model code were carried out for the SWSP alternatives, but these revisions do not affect any of the basic PROSIM operations logic.

The first modification was made to facilitate the iterative use of PROSIM 99.0 with the District's EBMUDSIM model for the Folsom South Canal Connection Alternative. The change allows the use of a monthly time series of EBMUD demands generated by EBMUDSIM to be used in conjunction with the PROSIM 99.0 Hodge Decision logic that determines when EBMUD could make diversions into the Folsom South Canal.

The second modification was implemented to increase PROSIM's capability to simulate the complex return flows resulting from diversions at the joint facility under the Joint Project Alternative. PROSIM 99.0 was modified so that a time series of return flow values could be specified downstream of joint American River intake facility to account for changes in monthly diversions for the City, County, and EBMUD.

#### **Incorporation of Draft Amendatory Contract Terms**

The contract terms now included in the Draft Amendatory Water Service Contract require slightly different operations than described in the Draft EIR/EIS. Generally, less water is available to EBMUD than assumed in the Draft EIR/EIS. Examples of contract terms that limit EBMUD deliveries are:

- Maximum delivery of 165,000 AF over three consecutive dry years under Alternative 3.
- 133,000 AF base entitlement (for application of deficiencies)

- No EBMUD delivery under Alternative 2 when it would cause or increase deficiencies for North of Delta CVP contractors (and CCWD).

The updated modeling uses PROSIM 99.0 and incorporates the best available information about the proposed alternatives.

### **Explanation of Tables in this Appendix**

A number of tables are included in this appendix to illustrate the fact that hydrologic modeling done using PROSIM 99.0 verifies the appropriateness of the original analysis included in the Draft EIR/EIS. Tables A and B provide a summary of average annual flow and storage statistics for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, respectively. As shown in these tables, the modeled effects of the project alternatives on system-wide hydrology using PROSIM 99.0 are very similar to effects that were disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS. No new or substantially different conclusions are reached in reviewing this information.

Tables 1-28 provide a comparison of project-level impacts of the alternatives on fisheries resources of the lower American River as well as Delta outflow and exports, the resources considered most sensitive to changes in the PROSIM model. As shown in these tables, the modeled effects of the project alternatives on system-wide hydrology using PROSIM 99.0 are very similar to effects that were disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS. No new or substantially different conclusions are reached in reviewing this information.

Similarly, Tables 29-51 provide a comparison of projected cumulative impacts of the alternatives on fisheries resources of the lower American River as well as Delta outflow and exports, the resources considered most sensitive to changes in the PROSIM model. Because Reclamation has not developed a model run under PROSIM 99.0 that is equivalent to the "existing conditions" model run used in the Draft EIR/EIS, these tables compare cumulative impacts under both the Draft EIR/EIS modeling and modeling done using PROSIM 99.0 by comparing projected cumulative impact conditions to the No-Action Alternative. This comparison provides a more realistic summary of projected cumulative impacts under the previous version of PROSIM used in the Draft EIR/EIS.

As shown in these tables, the modeled cumulative effects on system-wide hydrology using PROSIM 99.0 are very similar to effects that were disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS. No new or substantially different conclusions are reached in reviewing this information.

## **II. PROSIM Model and Hydrology Enhancements (USBR)**

Revised PROSIM analyses for the EBMUD Supplemental Water Supply Project (SWSP) alternatives were conducted with the most recent version of PROSIM, referred to as PROSIM 99.0, released by Reclamation in November 1998. This section discusses the enhancements incorporated into the PROSIM 99.0 model by Reclamation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as compared to the version of the model that was used to perform the analyses that were included in the Draft EIR/EIS. The surface water modeling conducted for the Draft EIR/EIS used Reclamation's PROSIM model version 5.73 with some additional modifications specific to the SWSP alternatives (Modified PROSIM 5.73). Similar modifications specific to the

SWSP alternatives were also made to PROSIM 99.0 and are described following the discussion of PROSIM 99.0

In comparison to Modified PROSIM 5.73, PROSIM 99.0 includes the following enhancements:

- A correction for the inconsistency in the input hydrology associated with the use of theoretical storage;
- A revised nodal configuration;
- Improved logic for the coordination of Trinity and Shasta Division operations;
- Updated logic for implementation of 3406(b)(2) Water Management actions; and
- Other corrections to the input hydrology.

These enhancements provide a more refined estimate of the available water supply and a better characterization of CVP operations. The net cumulative effect of the hydrology corrections is a general reduction in the estimated average annual water supply available in the Sacramento Valley with more prevalent reductions in drier years.

A detailed presentation of the modifications incorporated into PROSIM 99.0 was presented by Reclamation at a public workshop on November 20, 1998. A brief summary of the major model logic and input hydrology improvements incorporated into PROSIM 99.0 as presented at the workshop are provided in the following sections.

## **1. CODE AND MODEL LOGIC ENHANCEMENTS**

Code and model logic changes include a correction for the inconsistency associated with the use of theoretical storage as well as other improvements to allow PROSIM 99.0 to better characterize CVP operations.

### **a. Theoretical Storage Operations**

Under the lead of Reclamation, a team of experts developed modifications in the model logic and input hydrology to eliminate the inconsistency discovered in the use of theoretical storage.

Withdrawals from theoretical storage generally represent additional groundwater pumping, above historic levels, that are projected to occur at future levels of development due to increased water demand or reductions in available surface water supplies. Modified PROSIM 5.73 used a pre-operated time series of monthly values derived from the DWR Depletion Analysis Model. The Depletion Analysis Model provides the basic hydrologic data that is used to develop the PROSIM input hydrology. The addition of this withdrawal time series to Modified PROSIM 5.73 gains was inconsistent with the logic used within PROSIM to allocate CVP surface water supplies to Sacramento Valley CVP Contractors.

In PROSIM, water deliveries to Sacramento Valley CVP Contractors are composed of available Sacramento River flow, local gains, and releases from CVP reservoir storage. The addition of the withdrawals from theoretical storage to the gains caused PROSIM to incorrectly take credit for withdrawals as part of available CVP surface water supplies, thereby reducing the amount of water that needed to be released from Shasta Lake to meet contractor demands. This

inconsistency occurred primarily in drier years when the Depletion Analysis had utilized withdrawals from theoretical storage to supplement limited surface water supplies.

To correct the inconsistency, Reclamation removed the withdrawals from theoretical storage from the gains and developed new model logic that includes a dynamic monthly calculation of withdrawals from and recharge of theoretical storage. This new logic is consistent with the DWR methodology for calculating withdrawals from and recharge of theoretical storage. It is consistent with CVP allocation guidelines for deliveries to Sacramento Valley CVP Contractors. As compared to Modified PROSIM 5.73, these PROSIM 99.0 corrections do not change the amount of water delivered to CVP Sacramento River Water Rights Contractors, but do increase releases from Shasta Lake in drier years to meet these contract obligations. As a result, there may be less water available in CVP reservoir storage to meet other CVP operational objectives, including deliveries to water service contractors.

#### **b. Revised Node Configuration**

To better characterize the locations of the major agricultural diversions within the Sacramento River Basin, six nodes were added and three nodes were modified in PROSIM 99.0. A model node represents a physical location where accumulated gains, losses, diversions, and return flows are accounted.

#### **c. Trinity - Shasta Division Operations**

To better characterize the coordinated operation of the Trinity and Shasta Divisions of the CVP, Reclamation developed a new storage-diversion relationship to determine the amount of water to divert from the Trinity River Basin to the Sacramento River. This storage-diversion relationship accounts for both Shasta and Clair Engle Lake storage levels when determining the minimum amount of water to be diverted in a given month. The relationship in Modified PROSIM 5.73 accounted for Clair Engle Lake storage only. The minimum monthly and seasonal diversion targets used in this new relationship were developed by Reclamation based on current Trinity-Shasta Division operations that were initiated in the early 1990's.

#### **d. 3406(b)(2) Water Management Actions**

As compared to Modified PROSIM 5.73, PROSIM 99.0 includes a number of code modifications to allow simulation of the 3406(b)(2) Water Management actions in a manner that is similar to those defined in the November 20, 1997 Administrative Paper released by Reclamation and the Service. These changes allow the revised simulations to incorporate the instream 3406(b)(2) actions in a manner similar to that presented in the Administrative Paper, as compared to the preliminary actions that were implemented in the Draft SWSP alternatives. These changes include the use of storage-flow relationships to determine target flows for Clear Creek, the Sacramento River, and the American River under (b)(2) Water Management.

### **e. Variable SWP Demands**

PROSIM 99.0 incorporates variable water demands for SWP entitlement holders south of the Delta. DWR developed these demands for DWRSIM and they vary based on precipitation levels south of the Delta. These revised demands are more representative of actual SWP operations than the constant annual demands assumed in the Modified PROSIM 5.73 analyses. In Modified PROSIM 5.73, the constant annual demands were 4.2 million acre-feet. The revised annual demands range from 3.4 to 4.2 million acre-feet

## **2. INPUT HYDROLOGY ENHANCEMENTS**

In addition to modifications to the PROSIM model logic, Reclamation also incorporated a number of improvements associated with the model input hydrology. These improvements allow better characterization of the projected future available water supply in the American and Feather River Basins. A brief discussion of the hydrology modifications follows.

### **a. American River**

Two modifications were made to the PROSIM input hydrology associated with the American River. The first change included revised estimates for losses to groundwater along the lower American River. In Modified PROSIM 5.73, annual losses were assumed to be 42,000 acre-feet per year and were incorporated as a twelve-month repeating pattern. PROSIM 99.0 includes a time series of monthly seepage losses developed as part of the American River Water Resources Investigation (ARWRI). The use of the time series increases average annual losses to groundwater to about 130,000 acre-feet per year.

The City of Sacramento is located in DWR Depletion Area (DA) 59, but it is included in DWR's calculation of DA 70 historic depletion. To be consistent with DWR accounting, the second change corrected double counting of historic City of Sacramento exports in the original DA 70 PROSIM input hydrology. As a result, the revised DA 70 water supply is reduced by about 48,000 acre-feet on an average annual basis.

### **b. Feather River**

Two corrections were made to the input hydrology associated with the Feather River. The first change corrected double counting of inflow from Kelly Ridge, downstream of Lake Oroville, by modifying the DA 69 water supply calculations. This reduced available water supply in the Feather River Basin by about 70,000 acre-feet on an average annual basis. Secondly, the location of return flows from Feather River diversions were adjusted to be consistent with DWR assumptions in their monthly SWP/CVP simulation model (DWRSIM). In Modified PROSIM 5.73, return flows were located at downstream nodes on the Feather River. In PROSIM 99.0, return flows are located on the Sacramento River below Verona.

### 3. CVP ALLOCATION GUIDELINES

As part of the development of PROSIM 99.0, Reclamation revised the CVP allocation guidelines used in the PROSIM model. The allocation guidelines define the minimum level of water deliveries to CVP water service contractors and refuges and are used to successively reduce delivered quantities of water to balance demands and available supplies. As shown in the table below, the guidelines used in the Modified PROSIM 5.73 set minimum CVP deliveries to Municipal and Industrial (M&I) Water Service Contractors at 75 percent of the full contract amount based on historical water deliveries and use. The revised guidelines set minimum CVP deliveries to M&I Water Service Contractors at 50 percent of the contract amount.

No changes were made to the allocation guidelines for Sacramento River Water Rights and San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors. The minimum CVP delivery remains at 75 percent of the full contract amount based on the Shasta Index.

CVP minimum water deliveries to Agricultural Water Service Contractors also remain the same, at zero percent of the full contract amount.

#### CVP MINIMUM ALLOCATIONS

Water User	Allocation Guidelines Used in Draft SWSP Simulations	Allocation Guidelines Used in Revised Simulations
Sacramento River Water Rights and San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors	75% based on Shasta Criteria	75% based on Shasta Criteria
Agricultural Water Service	0% per Contract	0% per Contract
M&I Water Service	75% per Historical Use	50% Minimum
Refuges	75% based on Shasta Criteria	75% based on 40/30/30 Index

Per the U.S. Department of the Interior's (Interior) Final Administrative Paper on Refuge Water Supplies released in April 1998, minimum refuge deliveries of 75 percent would be made in critical dry water years as defined by the 40-30-30 Index (described in the SWRCB 1995 Water Quality Control Plan). Refuge allocation guidelines used in Modified PROSIM 5.73 set minimum refuge deliveries at 75 percent based on the Shasta Index. The use of the 40-30-30 Index results in reductions to a 75 percent delivery in 9 out of 69 simulated years, as compared to 6 years using the Shasta Index.

Detailed modeling input and output files are available for review if interested parties would like additional information.

**Table A. Summary of Average Annual Flow and Storage Statistics Using PROSIM 99 - Alternative 2**

Location	No Action		Alternative 2		Difference		Percent Change	
	Average	Dry	Average	Dry	Average	Dry	Average	Dry
<b>Release and Delivery</b> (Based on Average Annual Values)								
Delta Inflow	22389.0	12038.0	22388.0	12041.0	-1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
Delta Outflow	14866.0	6483.0	14855.0	6467.0	-11.0	-16.0	-0.1	-0.2
Tracy Export	2425.0	1608.0	2427.0	1629.0	2.0	21.0	0.1	1.3
Banks Export	3199.0	2125.0	3207.0	2124.0	8.0	-1.0	0.3	0.0
D-1485 Wheeling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Export Pumping	5624.0	3733.0	5634.0	3753.0	10.0	20.0	0.2	0.5
QWEST	1315.0	19.0	1326.0	7.0	11.0	-12.0	0.8	-63.2
Diversions from the Trinity River Basin	807.0	448.0	808.0	448.0	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Flow Down the Trinity River	570.0	416.0	570.0	416.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sacramento River Flow Below Shasta	5490.0	3926.0	5490.0	3929.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.1
Oroville Release	2974.0	1715.0	2976.0	1732.0	2.0	17.0	0.1	1.0
Folsom Release	2531.0	1584.0	2531.0	1582.0	0.0	-2.0	0.0	-0.1
North of Delta Nonproject Surface Water Use	1742.0	1782.0	1742.0	1782.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CVP Ag Delivery North of Delta	2444.0	1990.0	2444.0	1990.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CVP M&I Delivery North of Delta	530.0	478.0	530.0	478.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CVP Delivery South of Delta	2393.0	1446.0	2395.0	1460.0	2.0	14.0	0.1	1.0
Cross Valley Delivery	89.0	32.0	89.0	33.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.1
SWP Delivery South of Delta	3122.0	2093.0	3130.0	2093.0	8.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
SWP Feather River Delivery	67.0	67.0	67.0	67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Feather River Nonproject Surface Water Use	397.0	396.0	397.0	396.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Storage</b> (Based on End-of-Year Values, 1922-1990)								
Trinity	1349.6	674.4	1349.1	672.0	-0.5	-2.4	0.0	-0.4
Whiskeytown	235.0	235.0	235.0	235.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shasta	2605.9	1444.8	2602.9	1438.5	-3.0	-6.3	-0.1	-0.4
Oroville	2091.5	1326.9	2072.2	1265.1	-19.3	-61.8	-0.9	-4.7
Folsom	480.2	439.3	476.4	436.5	-3.8	-2.8	-0.8	-0.6
CVP Total Upstream Storage	4670.7	2793.5	4663.4	2781.9	-7.3	-11.6	-0.2	-0.4
CVP San Luis	221.9	299.6	222.0	286.4	0.1	-13.2	0.0	-4.4
SWP San Luis	264.0	171.4	261.5	171.4	-2.5	0.0	-0.9	0.0
Total San Luis	486.0	471.0	483.5	457.8	-2.5	-13.2	-0.5	-2.8

**Table B. Summary of Average Annual Flow and Storage Statistics Using PROSIM 99 - Alternative 3**

Location	No Action		Alternative 3		Difference		Percent Change	
	Average	Dry	Average	Dry	Average	Dry	Average	Dry
<b>Release and Delivery</b>								
<b>(Based on Average Annual Values)</b>								
Delta Inflow	22389.0	12038.0	22389.0	12028.0	0.0	-10.0	0.0	-0.1
Delta Outflow	14866.0	6483.0	14867.0	6476.0	1.0	-7.0	0.0	-0.1
Tracy Export	2425.0	1608.0	2425.0	1607.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	-0.1
Banks Export	3199.0	2125.0	3198.0	2124.0	-1.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0
D-1485 Wheeling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Export Pumping	5624.0	3733.0	5623.0	3730.0	-1.0	-3.0	0.0	-0.1
QWEST	1315.0	19.0	1329.0	25.0	14.0	6.0	1.1	31.6
Diversions from the Trinity River Basin	807.0	448.0	808.0	448.0	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Flow Down the Trinity River	570.0	416.0	570.0	416.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sacramento River Flow Below Shasta	5490.0	3926.0	5491.0	3934.0	1.0	8.0	0.0	0.2
Oroville Release	2974.0	1715.0	2976.0	1726.0	2.0	11.0	0.1	0.6
Folsom Release	2531.0	1584.0	2531.0	1583.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	-0.1
North of Delta Nonproject Surface Water Use	1742.0	1782.0	1699.0	1739.0	-43.0	-43.0	-2.5	-2.4
CVP Ag Delivery North of Delta	2444.0	1990.0	2444.0	1990.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CVP M&I Delivery North of Delta	530.0	478.0	659.0	619.0	129.0	141.0	24.3	29.5
CVP Delivery South of Delta	2393.0	1446.0	2393.0	1446.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cross Valley Delivery	89.0	32.0	89.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SWP Delivery South of Delta	3122.0	2093.0	3121.0	2093.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SWP Feather River Delivery	67.0	67.0	67.0	67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Feather River Nonproject Surface Water Use	397.0	396.0	397.0	396.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Storage</b>								
<b>(Based on End-of-Year Values, 1922-1990)</b>								
Trinity	1349.6	674.4	1347.6	669.9	-2.0	-4.5	-0.1	-0.7
Whiskeytown	235.0	235.0	235.0	235.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shasta	2605.9	1444.8	2595.5	1419.6	-10.4	-25.2	-0.4	-1.7
Oroville	2091.5	1326.9	2085.2	1290.3	-6.3	-36.6	-0.3	-2.8
Folsom	480.2	439.3	477.8	432.7	-2.4	-6.6	-0.5	-1.5
CVP Total Upstream Storage	4670.7	2793.5	4655.8	2757.2	-14.9	-36.3	-0.3	-1.3
CVP San Luis	221.9	299.6	222.4	291.9	0.5	-7.7	0.2	-2.6
SWP San Luis	264.0	171.4	262.5	171.4	-1.5	0.0	-0.6	0.0
Total San Luis	486.0	471.0	485.0	463.3	-1.0	-7.7	-0.2	-1.6

**Table 1. Effects of Changes in Reservoir Elevation on Warmwater Fish Habitat in Folsom Reservoir\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>410-Foot Surface Elevation</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	249	235	-1	-2	-5	-3
	(Apr-Jul)	89%	84%	0%	-1%	-2%	-1%
Juvenile/adult rearing	840	649	532	-12	-6	-8	-6
	(Oct-Sep)	77%	63%	-1%	<-1%	-1%	<-1%
<b>&lt;2-Foot Surface Elevation Decrease</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	162	170	10	0	3	-1
	(Apr-Jul)	58%	61%	2%	0%	1%	-1%
<b>&lt;20-Foot Surface Elevation Increase</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	254	263	7	1	11	0
	(Apr-Jul)	91%	94%	2%	0%	4%	0%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-7 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the reservoir elevation is at least 410 feet, reservoir surface elevation decreases by less than 2 feet per month, or the reservoir surface elevation increases by less than 20 feet per month.							
<sup>b</sup> Difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the reservoir elevation is above or below thresholds.							

**Table 2. Effects of Changes in Reservoir Storage on Coldwater Reservoir Fish Habitat \***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>a</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>a</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>a</sup>
Folsom Reservoir					
Juvenile/adult rearing	490	-21	-25	-15	-23
	(April-October)	-4%	-5%	-3%	-5%
Shasta Lake					
Juvenile/adult rearing	490	-6	0	-11	-13
	(April-October)	-1%	0%	-2%	-3%
Trinity Lake					
Juvenile/adult rearing	490	0	0	-17	-3
	(April-October)	0%	0%	-3%	-1%

\* This table was Table 5-8 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when reservoir storage is less than 5 or 10% of reservoir storage under Alternative 1.

Table 3. Hodge Decision and AFRP Flows (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)*							
Flows	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	280	254	202	0	-1	-4	-1
	(Nov-Feb)	91%	72%	0%	<-1%	-1%	<-1%
3,000 cfs	280	139	148	-1	-1	2	1
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	53%	-1%	<-1%	1%	0%
1,750 cfs	280	209	204	-17	-2	0	0
	(Jul-Oct)	75%	73%	-6%	-1%	0%	0%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	350	314	250	1	-1	-4	-1
	(Oct-Feb)	90%	71%	0%	<-1%	-1%	<-1%
3,000 cfs	280	139	148	-1	-1	2	1
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	53%	-1%	<-1%	1%	0%
2,500 cfs	70	40	44	0	-1	1	0
	(Jul)	57%	63%	0%	-1%	1%	0%
2,000 cfs	70	49	47	0	-1	0	-1
	(Aug)	70%	67%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%
1,500 cfs	70	42	51	0	-3	0	-2
	(Sep)	60%	73%	0%	-4%	0%	-3%
* This table was Table 5-9 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the flows meet or exceed the indicated minimum flows.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when flows meet or exceed the minimum flows.							

Table 4. Hodge Decision and AFRP Flows (Fairbairn WTP to I-5)							
Flows	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	280 (Nov-Feb)	238 84%	176 63%	-2 -1%	-6 -2%	-1 0%	-5 -2%
3,000 cfs	280 (Mar-Jun)	125 45%	133 48%	-2 -1%	0 0%	-1 0%	-4 -1%
1,750 cfs	280 (Jul-Oct)	176 63%	172 61%	4 1%	0 <-1%	0 0%	0 -1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	350 (Oct-Feb)	278 79%	218 62%	-6 -1%	-8 -2%	-1 0%	-10 -3%
3,000 cfs	280 (Mar-Jun)	125 45%	133 48%	-2 -1%	0 0%	1 0%	-4 -1%
2,500 cfs	70 (Jul)	20 29%	34 49%	0 0%	1 1%	-3 -4%	-1 -1%
2,000 cfs	70 (Aug)	25 36%	41 59%	-1 -2%	-2 -3%	-1 -1%	0 0%
1,500 cfs	70 (Sep)	36 51%	35 50%	0 0%	-1 -1%	0 0%	-3 -4%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-10 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the flows meet or exceed the indicated minimum flows.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when flows meet or exceed the minimum flows.							

Table 5. Hodge Decision and AFRP Flows (1-5 to the Mouth of the American River)*							
Flows	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	280	238	176	-2	-6	-5	-13
	(Nov-Feb)	84%	63%	-1%	-2%	-2%	-5%
3,000 cfs	280	125	133	-2	0	-2	-11
	(Mar-Jun)	45%	48%	-1%	0%	-1%	-4%
1,750 cfs	280	176	172	4	1	-19	-14
	(Jul-Oct)	63%	61%	1%	<1%	-7%	-5%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	350	278	218	-6	-8	-5	-18
	(Oct-Feb)	79%	62%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-5%
3,000 cfs	280	125	133	-2	0	-2	-11
	(Mar-Jun)	45%	48%	-1%	0%	-1%	-4%
2,500 cfs	70	20	34	0	1	-5	-3
	(Jul)	29%	49%	0%	1%	-7%	-4%
2,000 cfs	70	25	41	-1	-2	-1	-2
	(Aug)	36%	59%	-2%	-3%	-1%	-3%
1,500 cfs	70	36	35	0	-1	0	-3
	(Sep)	51%	50%	0%	-1%	0%	-4%
<sup>*</sup> This table was Table 5-11 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the flows meet or exceed the indicated minimum flows.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when flows meet or exceed the minimum flows.							

**Table 6. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Fall-Run Chinook Salmon (Nimbus Dam to Fairhair WTP)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210 (Sep–Nov)	160 76%	148 70%	6 3%	-1 <-1%	-2 -1%	0 0%
Spawning	210 (Oct–Dec)	188 90%	160 76%	-1 -1%	-1 <-1%	-4 -2%	-1 <-1%
Incubation	420 (Oct–Mar)	347 83%	296 70%	1 0%	-2 <-1%	-3 -1%	-1 <-1%
Rearing/emigration	420 (Jan–Jun)	265 63%	252 60%	4 1%	-2 <-1%	2 0%	1 <1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210 (Sep–Nov)	166 79%	148 70%	0 0%	-3 -1%	-2 -1%	-2 -1%
Spawning	210 (Oct–Dec)	188 90%	146 70%	-1 -1%	0 0%	-4 -1%	-1 <-1%
Incubation	420 (Oct–Mar)	347 83%	282 67%	1 0%	-1 <-0%	-3 -4%	-1 <-1%
Rearing/emigration	420 (Jan–Jun)	265 63%	252 60%	-1 0%	-2 <-1%	2 3%	1 <1%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-12 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 7. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Fall-Run Chinook Salmon (Fairbairn to 1-5)\*

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
		(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodgc Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210	154	120	2	1	-2	-6
	(Sep–Nov)	73%	57%	1%	0%	-1%	-3%
Rearing/emigration	420	242	225	2	-5	0	-7
	(Jan–Jun)	58%	54%	0%	-1%	0%	-2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210	138	118	-2	-3	0	-8
	(Sep–Nov)	66%	56%	-1%	-1%	0%	-4%
Rearing/emigration	420	242	225	-4	-5	0	-7
	(Jan–Jun)	58%	54%	-1%	-1%	0%	-2 %

\* This table was Table 5-13 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

**Table 8. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Fall-Run Chinook Salmon (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)**

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210	154	120	2	1	-19	-12
	(Sep–Nov)	73%	57%	1%	1%	-9%	-6%
Rearing/emigration	420	242	225	2	-5	-7	-17
	(Jan–Jun)	58%	54%	0%	-1%	-2%	-4%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210	138	118	-2	-3	0	-11
	(Sep–Nov)	66%	56%	-1%	-1%	0%	-5%
Rearing/emigration	420	242	225	-4	-5	-7	-17
	(Jan–Jun)	58%	54%	-1%	-1%	-2%	-4%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-14 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 9. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	255 73%	216 62%	1 0%	-2 -1%	3 0%	-1 <-1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	255 73%	216 62%	1 0%	-2 -1%	2 0%	-1 <-1%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-15 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 10. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (Fairbairn to I-5)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	235 67%	193 55%	1 0%	-5 -1%	-2 0%	-6 -2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	235 67%	193 55%	-4 -1%	-5 -1%	-4 -1%	-6 -2%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-16 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 11. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	235 67%	193 55%	1 0%	-5 -1%	-4 -1%	-12 -3%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	235 67%	193 55%	-4 -1%	-5 -1%	-4 -1%	-12 -3%
<div><div>* This table was Table 5-17 in the Draft EIR/EIS.</div><div><div><sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.</div><div><sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.</div></div></div>							

Table 12. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Steelhead (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)\*

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630	464	416	7	-3	-2	-2
	(Aug-Apr)	74%	66%	1%	<-1%	0%	<-1%
Spawning	350	255	216	1	-2	0	-1
	(Dec-Apr)	73%	62%	0%	-1%	0%	<-1%
Incubation	420	289	257	1	-2	0	-1
	(Dec-May)	69%	61%	0%	<-1%	0%	<-1%
Rearing	840	602	554	-18	-4	-2	0
	(Oct-Sep)	72%	66%	-2%	<-1%	0%	0%
Emigration	280	139	148	-1	-1	2	1
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	53%	-1%	<-1%	1%	<1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630	470	411	1	-6	-2	-4
	(Aug-Apr)	75%	65%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%
Spawning	350	255	216	1	-2	0	-1
	(Dec-Apr)	73%	62%	0%	-1%	0%	<-1%
Incubation	420	289	257	1	-2	0	-1
	(Dec-May)	69%	61%	0%	<-1%	0%	<-1%
Rearing	840	584	540	0	-7	-1	-3
	(Oct-Sep)	70%	64%	0%	-1%	0%	<-1%
Emigration	280	139	148	-1	-1	2	1
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	53%	-1%	<-1%	1%	<1%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-18 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 13. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Steelhead (Fairbairn WTP to I-5)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630 (August–April)	430 68%	358 57%	3 1%	-4 -1%	-1 0%	-13 -2%
Emigration	280 (March–June)	125 45%	133 48%	2 0%	0 0%	1 0%	-4 -1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630 (August–April)	398 63%	352 56%	-8% -1%	-10 -2%	31% 5%	-14 -2%
Emigration	280 (March–June)	125 45%	133 48%	-2 -1%	0 0%	1 0%	-4 -1%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-19 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 14. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Steelhead (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\*

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630	430	358	3	-4	-26	-27
	(August-April)	68%	57%	1%	-1%	-4%	-4%
Emigration	280	125	133	2	0	-2	-11
	(March-June)	45%	48%	0%	0%	-1%	-4%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630	398	352	-8	-10	-7	-25
	(August-April)	63%	56%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-4%
Emigration	280	125	133	-2	0	-2	-3
	(March-June)	45%	48%	-1%	0%	-1%	1%

\* This table was Table 5-20 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

**Table 15. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Striped Bass (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	315 64%	320 65%	-18 -3%	-3 -1%	1 0%	1 <1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	297 61%	306 62%	0 0%	-6 -1%	2 0%	-2 <-1%

\* This table was Table 5-21 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 16. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Striped Bass ( Fairbairn WTP to I-5)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	270 55%	274 56%	5 1%	0 0%	0 0%	-12 -2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	218 44%	254 52%	3 0%	-5 -1%	-4 -1%	-11 -2%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-22 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 17. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Striped Bass (I-5 to Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	270 55%	274 56%	5 1%	0 0%	-20 -4%	-24 -5%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	218 44%	254 52%	3 0%	-5 -1%	-7 -1%	-23 -5%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-23 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 18. Effects of Lower American River Flow on American Shad (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)**

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	170	169	-25	-2	1	2
	(April-July)	61%	60%	-9%	-1%	0%	1%
AFRP Flows							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	146	160	-1	-2	2	1
	(April-July)	52%	57%	0%	-1%	1%	<1%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-24 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 19. Effects of Lower American River Flow on American Shad (Fairbairn WTP to I-5) <sup>a</sup>							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	134	150	2	-1	1	-5
	(April-July)	48%	54%	1%	<-1%	0%	-2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	114	136	-2	0	-3	-4
	(April-July)	41%	49%	-1%	0%	-1%	-1%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-25 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 20. Effects of Lower American River Flow on American Shad (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\*

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	134	150	2	-1	0	-12
	(April– July)	48%	54%	1%	<-1%	0%	-4%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	114	136	-2	0	-6	-13
	(April– July)	41%	49%	-1%	0%	-2%	-5%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-26 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 21. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Splittail (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>3,500-cfs Flows</b>							
Spawning/incubation/ rearing	210 (February–April)	84 40%	81 39%	2 1%	-1 <-1%	1 0%	0 0%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-27 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 22. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Splittail (Fairbairn WTP to I-5)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>3,500-cfs Flows</b>							
Spawning/incubation/ rearing	210 (February–April)	84 40%	80 38%	-3 -1%	-2 -1%	0 0%	-1 <-1%
* This table was Table 5-28 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 23. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Splittail (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>3,500-cfs Flows</b>							
Spawning/incubation/ rearing	210 (February–April)	84 40%	80 38%	-3 -1%	-2 -1%	0 0%	-3 -1%

\* This table was Table 5-29 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.

**Table 24. Percent of Months with Potential to Have at Least a 1°F Increase or Decrease at Four Locations along the American River under Alternatives 2 and 3\***

	Increase				Decrease			
	Alternative 2		Alternative 3		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
	Draft EIR/EIS Version	New PROSIM	Draft EIR/EIS Version	New PROSIM	Draft EIR/EIS Version	New PROSIM	Draft EIR/EIS Version	New PROSIM
<b>Nimbus Dam</b>								
October	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
January	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
March	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
April	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
May	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
June	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
July	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
August	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	1	0
September	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
<b>Goethe Park</b>								
October	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
January	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
March	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
April	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
May	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
June	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
July	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
August	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
September	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
<b>Fairbairn WTP</b>								
October	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
January	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
March	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
April	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
May	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
June	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
July	1	1.4	0	0	1	0	3	0
August	3	1.4	0	0	3	0	1	0
September	1	1.4	0	0	1	1.4	1	0
<b>Month</b>								
October	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
January	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
March	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
April	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0
May	1	1.4	0	0	1	0	1	0
June	7	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
July	3	2.9	0	0	1	1.4	3	0
August	4	7.1	1	1.4	3	1.4	3	0
September	3	2.9	0	0	3	2.9	1	0

\* This table was Table 5-30 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

**Table 25. Comparison of Delta Outflow Required\***

Month	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
	Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS Project Change (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS Project Change (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>b</sup>
October	68 97%	69 99%	-1 -2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
November	69 99%	68 97%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	-1 -1%
December	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
January	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
February	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
March	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
April	68 97%	68 97%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
May	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
June	70 100%	67 96%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
July	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
August	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
September	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

\* This table was Table 5-31 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the simulated 70-year period when the minimum Delta outflow requirements are met.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the minimum Delta outflow requirements are met.

**Table 26. Comparison of Delta Exports\***

Month	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
	Months/ Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change (Months/ Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change (Months/ Percent) <sup>b</sup>
October	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
November	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
December	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
January	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
February	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
March	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
April	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
May	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
June	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
July	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
August	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%
September	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%

\* This table was Table 5-32 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the simulated 70-year period when the minimum Delta export requirements are met.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the Delta export requirements are met.

Table 27. Effects of Changes in Reservoir Elevation on Warmwater Fish Habitat in Shasta Lake<sup>a</sup>

Life Stage	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS	Project Change New PROSIM Version
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>1,017-Foot Surface Elevation</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	220	197	0	-1	0	-1
	(Apr-Jul)	79%	70%	0%	<-1%	0%	<-1%
Juvenile/adult rearing	840	482	425	-2	-5	-1	-5
	(Oct-Sep)	57%	51%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%
<b>&lt;2-Foot Surface Elevation Decrease</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	117	110	-2	-2	-1	-3
	(Apr-Jul)	42%	39%	-1%	<-1%	-1%	-1%
<b>&lt;20-Foot Surface Elevation Increase</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	267	267	0	0	0	0
	(Apr-Jul)	95%	95%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-33 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the reservoir elevation is at least 1,017 feet, reservoir surface elevation decreases by less than 2 feet per month, or the reservoir surface elevation increases by less than 20 feet per month.							
<sup>b</sup> Difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the reservoir elevation is above or below thresholds.							

**Table 28. Effects of Changes in Reservoir Elevation on Warmwater Fish Habitat in Trinity Lake<sup>a</sup>**

Life Stage	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>2,295-Foot Surface Elevation</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	122	204	-3	0	10	0
	(Apr-Jul)	44%	73%	-1%	0%	3%	0%
Juvenile/adult rearing	840	244	516	-2	-5	3	-5
	(Oct-Sep)	29%	61%	0%	<-1%	0%	<-1%
<b>&lt;2-Foot Surface Elevation Decrease</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	96	130	2	1	3	0
	(Apr-Jul)	34%	46%	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>&lt;20-Foot Surface Elevation Increase</b>							
Spawning/incubation	280	276	270	0	0	0	1
	(Apr-Jul)	99%	96%	0%	0%	0%	1%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-34 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the reservoir elevation is at least 2,295 feet, reservoir surface elevation decreases by less than 2 feet per month, or the reservoir surface elevation increases by less than 20 feet per month.

<sup>b</sup> Difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the reservoir elevation is above or below thresholds.

**Table 29. Hodge Decision and AFRP Flows (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)**

Flows	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
				(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
2,000 cfs	280	254	202	247	190	246	194
	(Nov-Feb)	91%	72%	-3%	-4%	-3%	-3%
3,000 cfs	280	139	148	129	143	131	143
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	53%	-4%	-2%	-3%	-2%
1,750 cfs	280	209	204	189	198	198	199
	(Jul-Oct)	75%	73%	-7%	-2%	-4%	-2%
AFRP Flows							
2,000 cfs	350	314	245	305	232	304	237
	(Oct-Feb)	90%	70%	-3%	-4%	-3%	-2%
3,000 cfs	280	139	144	129	139	131	139
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	51%	-4%	-2%	-3%	-2%
2,500 cfs	70	40	43	39	36	39	38
	(Jul)	57%	61%	-1%	-10%	-1%	-7%
2,000 cfs	70	49	46	45	44	45	45
	(Aug)	70%	66%	-6%	-3%	-6%	-1%
1,500 cfs	70	42	50	38	47	39	47
	(Sep)	60%	71%	-6%	-4%	-4%	-4%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-9 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the flows meet or exceed the indicated minimum flows.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when flows meet or exceed the minimum flows.

**Table 30. Hodge Decision and AFRP Flows (Fairbairn WTP to I-5)\***

Flows	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
		(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
2,000 cfs	280	235	176	209	152	218	164
	(Nov-Feb)	84%	63%	-9%	-9%	-6%	-4%
3,000 cfs	280	123	133	97	127	111	129
	(Mar-Jun)	44%	48%	-9%	-2%	-4%	-1%
1,750 cfs	280	176	172	116	164	163	167
	(Jul-Oct)	63%	61%	-21%	-3%	-5%	-2%
AFRP Flows							
2,000 cfs	350	278	218	244	186	258	202
	(Oct-Feb)	79%	62%	-10%	-9%	-6%	-5%
3,000 cfs	280	123	133	97	127	111	129
	(Mar-Jun)	44%	48%	-9%	-2%	-4%	-1%
2,500 cfs	70	20	34	8	26	12	31
	(Jul)	29%	49%	-17%	-11%	-11%	-4%
2,000 cfs	70	25	41	13	35	16	36
	(Aug)	36%	59%	-17%	-9%	-13%	-7%
1,500 cfs	70	36	35	26	31	31	32
	(Sep)	51%	50%	-14%	-6%	-7%	-4%

\* This table was Table 5-10 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the flows meet or exceed the indicated minimum flows.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when flows meet or exceed the minimum flows.

Table 31. Hodge Decision and AFRP Flows (1-5 to the Mouth of the American River)							
Flows	Number of Months (Relevant Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	280 (Nov-Feb)	235 84%	176 63%	209 -9%	152 -9%	210 -9%	164 -4%
3,000 cfs	280 (Mar-Jun)	123 44%	133 48%	97 -9%	127 -2%	104 -7%	125 -3%
1,750 cfs	280 (Jul-Oct)	176 63%	172 61%	116 -21%	164 -3%	120 -20%	166 -2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
2,000 cfs	350 (Oct-Feb)	278 79%	218 62%	244 -10%	186 -9%	235 -12%	202 -5%
3,000 cfs	280 (Mar-Jun)	123 44%	133 48%	97 -9%	127 -2%	104 -7%	125 -3%
2,500 cfs	70 (Jul)	20 29%	34 49%	8 -17%	26 -11%	7 -19%	31 -4%
2,000 cfs	70 (Aug)	25 36%	41 59%	13 -17%	35 -9%	14 -16%	36 -7%
1,500 cfs	70 (Sep)	36 51%	35 50%	26 -14%	31 -6%	27 -13%	32 -4%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-11 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the relevant period when the flows meet or exceed the indicated minimum flows.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the relevant period between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when flows meet or exceed the minimum flows.							

**Table 32. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Fall-Run Chinook Salmon (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)<sup>a</sup>**

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
		(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
Adult migration	210	160	148	146	144	151	144
	(Sep–Nov)	76%	70%	-7%	-2%	-4%	-2%
Spawning	210	188	160	182	154	182	155
	(Oct–Dec)	90%	76%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Incubation	420	347	296	335	282	335	286
	(Oct–Mar)	83%	70%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Rearing/emigration	420	265	252	252	239	253	242
	(Jan–Jun)	63%	60%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%
AFRP Flows							
Adult migration	210	166	145	158	140	159	141
	(Sep–Nov)	79%	69%	-4%	-2%	-3%	-2%
Spawning	210	188	143	182	138	182	140
	(Oct–Dec)	90%	68%	-3%	-2%	-3%	-1%
Incubation	420	347	276	335	263	335	268
	(Oct–Mar)	83%	66%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Rearing/emigration	420	265	246	252	233	253	236
	(Jan–Jun)	63%	59%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-12 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 33. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Fall-Run Chinook Salmon (Fairbairn to I-5)\*

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
				(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
Adult migration	210	154	120	111	109	138	114
	(Sep–Nov)	73%	57%	-20%	-5%	-8%	-3%
Spawning	210	178	132	139	119	164	121
	(Oct–Dec)	85%	63%	-19%	-6%	-7%	-5%
Incubation	420	325	255	269	224	303	239
	(Oct–Mar)	77%	61%	-13%	-7%	-5%	-4%
Rearing/emigration	420	240	225	205	203	223	216
	(Jan–Jun)	57%	54%	-8%	-5%	-4%	-2%
AFRP Flows							
Adult migration	210	138	118	111	103	124	110
	(Sep–Nov)	66%	56%	-13%	-7%	-7%	-4%
Rearing/emigration	420	240	225	205	203	223	216
	(Jan–Jun)	57%	54%	-8%	-5%	-4%	-2 %

\* This table was Table 5-13 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 34. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Fall-Run Chinook Salmon (1-5 to the Mouth of the American River) <sup>a</sup>							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210 (Sep-Nov)	154 73%	120 57%	111 -20%	109 -5%	119 -17%	114 -3%
Rearing/emigration	420 (Jan-Jun)	240 57%	225 54%	205 -8%	203 -5%	208 -8%	212 -3%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	210 (Sep-Nov)	138 66%	118 56%	111 -13%	103 -7%	105 -16%	110 -4%
Rearing/emigration	420 (Jan-Jun)	240 57%	225 54%	205 -8%	203 -5%	208 -8%	212 -3%

<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-14 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 35. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	255 73%	216 62%	244 -3%	203 -4%	245 -3%	208 -2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	255 73%	211 60%	244 -3%	198 -4%	245 -3%	203 -2%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-15 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 36. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (Fairbairn to I-5)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	233 67%	193 55%	206 -8%	169 -7%	219 -4%	183 -3%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	233 67%	193 55%	206 -8%	169 -7%	219 -4%	183 -3%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-16 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 37. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	233 67%	193 55%	206 -8%	169 -7%	210 -7%	179 -4%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing/emigration	350 (December–April)	233 67%	193 55%	206 -8%	169 -7%	210 -7%	179 -4%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-17 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 38. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Steelhead (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630	464	416	435	396	441	401
	(Aug-Apr)	74%	66%	-5%	-3%	-4%	-2%
Spawning	350	255	216	244	203	245	208
	(Dec-Apr)	73%	62%	-3%	-4%	-3%	-2%
Incubation	420	289	257	276	243	278	248
	(Dec-May)	69%	61%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Rearing	840	602	554	565	531	575	536
	(Oct-Sep)	72%	66%	-4%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Emigration	280	139	148	129	143	131	143
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	53%	-4%	-2%	-3%	-2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630	470	402	447	382	449	389
	(Aug-Apr)	75%	64%	-4%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Spawning	350	255	211	244	198	245	203
	(Dec-Apr)	73%	60%	-3%	-4%	-3%	-2%
Incubation	420	289	251	276	237	278	242
	(Dec-May)	69%	60%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%
Rearing	840	584	528	556	498	558	506
	(Oct-Sep)	70%	63%	-3%	-4%	-3%	-3%
Emigration	280	139	144	129	139	131	139
	(Mar-Jun)	50%	51%	-4%	-2%	-3%	-2%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-18 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 39. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Steelhead (Fairbairn WTP to I-5)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630 (Aug-Apr)	428 68%	358 57%	333 -15%	321 -6%	396 -5%	340 -3%
Spawning	350 (Dec-Apr)	233 67%	193 55%	206 -8%	169 -7%	219 -4%	183 -3%
Incubation	420 (Dec-May)	262 62%	231 55%	226 -9%	206 -6%	245 -4%	219 -3%
Rearing	840 (Oct-Sep)	534 64%	481 57%	422 -13%	443 -5%	492 -5%	460 -2%
Emigration	280 (Mar-Jun)	123 44%	133 48%	97 -9%	127 -2%	111 -4%	129 -1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration	630 (Aug-Apr)	396 63%	352 56%	330 -10%	307 -7%	359 -6%	329 -4%
Emigration	280 (Mar-Jun)	123 44%	133 48%	97 -9%	127 -2%	111 -4%	129 -1%

\* This table was Table 5-19 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

**Table 40. Effects of Lower American River Flows on Steelhead (1-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
		(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
Adult migration	630 (August–April)	428 68%	358 57%	333 -15%	321 -6%	344 -13%	335 -4%
Emigration	280 (March–June)	123 44%	133 48%	97 -9%	127 -2%	104 -7%	125 -3%
AFRP Flows							
Adult migration	630 (August–April)	396 63%	352 56%	330 -10%	307 -7%	329 -11%	325 -4%
Emigration	280 (March–June)	123 44%	133 48%	97 -9%	127 -2%	104 -7%	125 -3%

\* This table was Table 5-20 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 41. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Striped Bass (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	315 64%	320 65%	288 -6%	309 -2%	298 -3%	310 -2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	297 61%	299 61%	279 -4%	281 -4%	281 -3%	285 -3%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-21 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 42. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Striped Bass ( Fairbairn WTP to I-5)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	269 55%	274 56%	191 -16%	262 -2%	247 -4%	265 -2%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	217 44%	254 52%	157 -12%	224 -6%	183 -7%	235 -4%
<hr/>							
* This table was Table 5-22 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 43. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Striped Bass (I-5 to Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	269 55%	274 56%	191 -16%	262 -2%	198 -14%	261 -3%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Rearing	490 (April–October)	217 44%	254 52%	157 -12%	224 -6%	151 -13%	232 -4%

\* This table was Table 5-23 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

Table 44. Effects of Lower American River Flow on American Shad (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	170	169	159	164	164	165
	(April-July)	61%	60%	-4%	-2%	-2%	-1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	146	156	138	144	139	146
	(April-July)	52%	56%	-3%	-4%	-3%	-4%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-24 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 45. Effects of Lower American River Flow on American Shad (Fairbairn WTP to I-5)*							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Hodge Decision Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	133	150	114	148	123	148
	(April-July)	48%	54%	-7%	-1%	-4%	-1%
<b>AFRP Flows</b>							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	113	136	83	124	96	129
	(April-July)	40%	49%	-11%	-4%	-6%	-3%
* This table was Table 5-25 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 46. Effects of Lower American River Flow on American Shad (I-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
		(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
Hodge Decision Flows							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	133	150	114	148	117	145
	(April–July)	48%	54%	-7%	-1%	-6%	-2%
AFRP Flows							
Adult migration/ spawning/incubation	280	113	136	83	124	85	126
	(April–July)	40%	49%	-11%	-4%	-10%	-4%

\* This table was Table 5-26 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when minimum Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when Hodge Decision or AFRP flows are met or exceeded.

**Table 47. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Splittail (Nimbus Dam to Fairbairn WTP)**

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	(Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>3,500-cfs Flows</b>							
Spawning/incubation/ rearing	210 (February–April)	126 60%	130 62%	136 5%	138 4%	127 0%	132 1%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-27 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							

Table 48. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Splittail (Fairbairn WTP to I-5) <sup>a</sup>							
Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Project Change New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>3,500-cfs Flows</b>							
Spawning/incubation/ rearing	210 (February–April)	126 60%	132 63%	142 8%	141 4%	131 2%	135 1%
<sup>a</sup> This table was Table 5-28 in the Draft EIR/EIS.							
<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							
<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.							

**Table 49. Effects of Lower American River Flow on Splittail (1-5 to the Mouth of the American River)\***

Life Stage	Number of Months (Critical Period)	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
		Draft EIR/EIS	New PROSIM Version	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change	Project Change
		Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>
<b>3,500-cfs Flows</b>							
Spawning/incubation/ rearing	210 (February–April)	126 60%	132 63%	142 8%	141 4%	138 6%	138 3%

\* This table was Table 5-29 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the critical life stage period when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months during the critical life stage periods between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when 3,500-cfs flows are met or exceeded.

**Table 50. Comparison of Delta Outflow Required\***

Month	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
	Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS Project Change (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS Project Change (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>b</sup>
October	68 99%	69 99%	1 1%	1 1%	1 0%	1 1%
November	69 100%	68 97%	0 0%	1 1%	0 0%	2 3%
December	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
January	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
February	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
March	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
April	68 99%	67 98%	0 0%	1 1%	0 0%	2 3%
May	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
June	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	-3 -4%	0 0%	0 0%
July	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
August	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
September	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

\* This table was Table 5-31 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the simulated 70-year period when the minimum Delta outflow requirements are met.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the minimum Delta outflow requirements are met.

**Table 51. Comparison of Delta Exports\***

Month	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 Cumulative		Alternative 3 Cumulative	
	Draft EIR/EIS Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>a</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS Project Change (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>b</sup>	Draft EIR/EIS Project Change (Months/Percent) <sup>b</sup>	New PROSIM Version Months/Percent <sup>b</sup>
October	70 100%	51 73%	0 0%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%
November	70 100%	57 81%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%
December	70 100%	62 89%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
January	70 100%	65 93%	0 0%	-2 -3%	0 0%	-1 -1%
February	70 100%	68 97%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
March	70 100%	68 97%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%
April	70 100%	69 99%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
May	70 100%	70 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
June	70 100%	64 91%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%
July	70 100%	61 87%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	-1 -1%
August	70 100%	55 79%	0 0%	-1 -2%	0 0%	-1 -2%
September	70 100%	50 71%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%

\* This table was Table 5-31 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

<sup>a</sup> Number and percentage of months during the simulated 70-year period when the minimum Delta outflow requirements are met.

<sup>b</sup> The difference in the number and percentage of months between Alternatives 2 and 3 and Alternative 1 when the minimum Delta outflow requirements are met.